

D613
SS

5

THE ALLIES PLEDGED TO A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE

CONTENTS

	Page.
Official Statements.....	3-8
Probable Details of the International Constitution.....	9-15
The Necessary Mechanism.....	15-17
Summary and Conclusion as to World Peace.....	17-22
Expert Opinion.....	22-30
Anthem to the World State.....	30
Answer to an Objection.....	31

BY

GEORGE H. SHIBLEY

Director of The Research Institute, Washington, D. C.

ON SALE BY RETAIL NEWSDEALERS

Price 10 Cents

PUBLISHED BY THE

LEAGUE FOR WORLD PEACE

INTERNATIONAL HEADQUARTERS
WOODWARD BUILDING
WASHINGTON, D. C., U. S. A.

Vol. I, No. I, THE WORLD STATE, Quarterly,
25 Cents Per Year

COPYRIGHT, 1915,
GEORGE H. SHIBLEY.
Translations Forthcoming.

THE GIBSON PRESS

OFFICE

PRESS OF GIBSON BROS.



WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE ALLIES PLEDGED TO A UNITED STATES OF EUROPE.

CHAPTER I. OFFICIAL STATEMENT.

Few people realize that the Allies are determined that this fearful War of Nations shall be the last vast war that is to be permitted to crucify men and women upon this planet. In some strange way this openly stated attitude of the Allies has not become generally known. Here are some of the facts.

TREATY OF SEPTEMBER 5, 1914.

Five weeks after the outbreak of the war the governments of Great Britain, France, and Russia declared:

"The British, French, and Russian Governments mutually engage not to conclude peace separately during the present war. The three governments agree that when terms of peace come to be discussed no one of the Allies will demand terms of peace without the previous agreement of each of the other Allies."

Later this treaty was agreed to by Japan and Serbia.

After this formal treaty was signed the Prime Ministers in Great Britain and in France declared their government's attitude. Mr. Asquith in a speech at the Guildhall, London, November 9, 1914, stated more explicitly than he had yet done the following:

ATTITUDE OF THE ALLIES.

"We shall never sheathe the sword which we have not lightly drawn until Belgium recovers in full measure all, and more than all, that she has sacrificed, until France is adequately secured against the menace of aggression, until the rights of the smaller

nationalities of Europe are placed upon an unassailable foundation, and until the military domination of Prussia is wholly and finally destroyed."

Here are four very important propositions.

At the assembling of the French Parliament, December 22, 1914, M. Viviani, the French Premier, in the ministerial declaration read to the chamber, said:

"Since, in spite of their attachment to peace, France and her Allies have been obliged to endure war, they will wage it to the end. Faithful to the signature which she set to the Treaty of September 4 last, in which she engaged her honour—that is to say, her life—France, in accord with her Allies, will not lay down her arms until she has avenged outraged right, regained forever the provinces torn from her by force, restored to heroic Belgium the fullness of her material prosperity and her political independence, and broken Prussian militarism, so that on the basis of justice she may rebuild a regenerated Europe."

It is clear that both the French and the British Governments are agreed that Prussian militarism shall be broken, and the British assert that it must be "wholly and finally destroyed."

HOW CAN THE MILITARY DOMINATION OF PRUSSIA BE WHOLLY AND FINALLY DESTROYED? THE ONLY PRACTICABLE WAY IS TO ESTABLISH A UNIFIED POWER AMONG THE COUNTRIES NOW AT WAR, TO BE LIMITED AT THE START TO THE MAINTENANCE OF PERMANENT PEACE BASED ON JUSTICE. This is quite plainly stated in a speech by the British Prime Minister on September 25, 1914, three weeks after the consummation of the treaty between the Allies. Mr. Asquith said:

"I should like, beyond this inquiry into causes and motives, to ask your attention and that of my fellow-countrymen to the end which, in this war, we ought to keep in view. Forty-four years ago, at the time of the war of 1870, Mr. Gladstone used these words. He said: 'The greatest triumph of our time will be the enthronement of the idea of public right as the governing idea of European politics.' Nearly fifty years have passed. Little

**A United
States of
Europe.**

progress, it seems, has as yet been made towards that good and beneficent change, but it seems to be now at this moment as good a definition as we can have of *our* European policy—the *idea of public right*. What does it mean when translated into concrete terms? It means first and foremost, the clearing of the ground by the definite repudiation of Militarism as the governing factor in the relations of States and of the future moulding of the European world. It means next that room must be found and kept for the independent existence and the free development of the smaller nationalities, each with a corporate consciousness of its own. Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland and Scandinavian countries, Greece and the Balkan States—they must be recognized as having exactly as good a title as their powerful neighbours, more powerful in strength and in wealth, ‘to a place in the sun.’ And it means finally, or it ought to mean, perhaps, by a slow and gradual process, the substitution of force, for the class of competing ambition, for groupings and alliances and a precarious equipoise, OF A REAL EUROPEAN PARTNERSHIP BASED ON THE RECOGNITION OF EQUAL RIGHTS, AND ESTABLISHED AND ENFORCED BY A COMMON WILL. [THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE.] A year ago that would have sounded like a Utopian idea. It is probably one that may not, or will not be realized either to-day or to-morrow. BUT WHEN THIS WAR IS DECIDED IN FAVOR OF THE ALLIES IT WILL AT ONCE COME WITHIN THE RANGE AND BEFORE LONG WITHIN THE GRASP OF EUROPEAN STATESMANSHIP.”

Inasmuch as the object of the international government will at the start be limited to the maintenance of peace, the name may well be THE PEACE COUNCIL OF EUROPE.

Three days after the Liberal leader had declared the Government's position, the following statement was made by the Conservative leader, Mr. Bonar Law:

“We have no desire to humiliate the German people, but we are determined that this war, with all the cruel suffering which it has entailed and will entail, shall not be fought in vain. We are determined that in our time and in that of our children NEVER AGAIN SHALL THAT DREAD SPECTRE WHICH HAS HAUNTED US LIKE A NIGHTMARE, HAVE POWER TO FRIGHTEN. We have put our hand to the plough, and we will not turn back until we

have made sure that the law not of might but of right, that the law not of force but of humanity and justice, IS THE LAW WHICH MUST GOVERN THE WORLD."

To the same effect is a statement by the former Conservative leader, Mr. Balfour. In an address on December 12, last year, he said:

"Are the powerful always going to trample on the weak? Is the fate of the small nations always to be a miserable fate? To me, and I believe to all men of English speech, wherever they live, to whatever nation they may belong, it seems that the future of our race—the international future of our race—lies in, so far as possible, SPREADING WIDE THE GRIP AND POWER OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, OF RAISING MORE AND MORE THE DIGNITY OF TREATIES BETWEEN STATES, MORE AND MORE STRIVING THAT CONTROVERSIES BETWEEN STATES—those small causes of friction which arise between different Governments, as they arise in any community between different individuals—SHOULD BE DECIDED NOT BY THE SWORD, BUT BY ARBITRATION. That is the ideal which we hold. That is the ideal which we wish to see grow in all parts of the world. That is the ideal which, with every contumely, every mark of contempt and derision, the Germans trample under foot both in theory and in practice."

Thus in Great Britain both the Liberal and the Conservative parties are agreed in standing for a real remedy for militarism and war—the unification of Europe and of the world on questions of international right and justice.

This is what the British Liberal Government stood for in 1907 at the Second Hague Conference, and with it were 32 other governments. They voted to submit all international disputes to Compulsory Arbitration except questions affecting independence, honor, or vital interest. Standing with the British Liberal Government (dating from 1906) was the French Liberal Government (dating from 1900), the Russian Government and 29 other governments including those of Spain, Portugal, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and the United States of America. Opposed was the German Government (threatened

by the Socialists), the Austro-Hungarian and the Italian Governments (both threatened by the Socialists), and 9 other governments, namely, Bulgaria, Roumania, Montenegro, Greece (all four looking for relief from Turkey), Turkey, Switzerland, Belgium, Luxembourg, and Japan. Italy, Japan and Luxembourg abstained from voting and, therefore, were against the proposition. Doubtless the reason why Switzerland, Belgium and Luxembourg refused to vote for the system was that it was

Second certain that the proposal would fail of receiving
Hague a unanimous vote and so would not carry. It
Conference, was Germany's opposition that set the pace and
1907. defeated the proposal. In the words of Dr. James Brown Scott, in his history of this conference:

"Weeks of discussion failed to overcome the opposition of Germany and its slender following. . . . Germany has not been an exponent of arbitration; its triumphs, leaving aside literature, science and philosophy, have been upon the battlefield. It realized the hopes of centuries in a united German nation, not in the study, but in the field, and, surrounded as it is by powerful and aggressive neighbours, it is determined to hold by the sword that which the sword has won. It is seemingly unwilling to intrust its interests to the world at large, and it claims and exercises the right to form its judgment untrammelled by treaty or public opinion. The 'era of blood and iron' is not yet past." (Vol. i, 128.)

It is clear that in the year of our Lord 1907 the only thing that stood in the way of the establishment of International Government for the attainment of permanent peace and disarmament was the Conservative German Government—the rule of the Few, but it was threatened by a revolutionary element entirely different from that which had come into power in France and England. In these two countries the Liberal Governments are basically different from the proposed Socialist Government for Germany and for Austria-Hungary.

Equally important is the fact that in 1907 the Triple *Entente*, Great Britain, France and Russia, stood for the establishment

of permanent peace and disarmament. The Russian Government proposed disarmament in its call for the First Hague Conference, and at the second of these conferences, in 1907, the proposition was expressly voted for by the Liberal Governments in France, Great Britain, the United States, Argentina and Chili.

Stated in other words, in 1907, Great Britain, France and Russia stood for permanent peace and disarmament. The Russian Government proposed disarmament in 1898 in its call for the First Hague Conference, and in 1907 disarmament was expressly voted by the French and the British Governments and several others, but as it was known that the plan would not be accepted by the Triple Alliance, the Russian Government did not express itself. Since the outbreak of the War of Nations the French and the Russian Governments are unquestionably of the same opinion as in 1907 that permanent peace and disarmament should be established. This is evidenced by the reiterated statement by the British Government that one of the terms of peace must be the complete removal of the means of Prussian Militarism (page 11, below), and the fact that the treaty between the Allies of September 5, 1914, provides that "The three governments agree that when terms of peace come to be discussed no one of the Allies will demand terms of peace *without the previous agreement of the other Allies.*" Therefore we can say in truth that THE ALLIES ARE PLEDGED TO ABOLISH WAR. That is a fact of tremendous importance. Very few people realize it. The recognition of this fact puts an end to the validity of the argument that should the Allies win it would continue Britain's lordship of the seas. On the contrary, it would result in the formation of the United States of Europe and of the World, wherein all nations would be assured equal rights upon the seas and in all the straits and other public waters.

CHAPTER II.

PROBABLE DETAILS OF THE INTERNATIONAL CONSTITUTION.

In Europe the Allies are planning the details of the proposed Constitution of the United States of Europe, to apply at the start to the countries now at war. Inasmuch as the constitution will necessarily include a description of the fundamental rights of the contracting parties, the national states, it must include the following fundamental rights:

FUNDAMENTAL INTERNATIONAL RIGHTS.

1. Equal rights. This principle is the basis of justice.
2. The right to home rule. The self-interest of each of the contracting parties will cause them to thus mark out this vital right. Home rule is the right of a state to regulate its own domestic affairs, which includes the determination of who shall be permitted to come within its borders; who shall become citizens and voters; and regulation of the rules governing the import and export of products.
3. The right to free and equal use of the high seas, together with equal rights in trade routes, such as the straits and channels, and the Suez canal.
4. The right to reduce armament without limit.

These are some of the rights that will be marked out for each state in Europe.

PROTECTION FROM THE REVOLUTIONARY SOCIALISTS.

It may be that the constitution of the United States of Europe will contain a guaranty against revolution by Socialists. The people of Europe as a whole may decide that their combined power shall be used against the attempt that is being made in every country in Europe to place the wage-earners in power as a class to the end that the Government shall confiscate all private

property, after which every individual shall be obliged to work in the particular place that the Government shall specify.

The opposite system is being applied by the Liberal Parties in France, Great Britain, Scandinavia, and other countries.

The German and Austro-Hungarian Governments would doubtless be glad to agree to peace terms that shall include this guaranty against revolution by the Socialists provided other parts of the proposed settlement be not too harsh. The fact is that the power of the German Allies is so great that their opponents may well consider the advisability of agreeing to stop the war on condition that each side shall pay its own debts, and that each subject race shall become free. This latter point is treated quite fully in a subsequent chapter.

EXTENT OF THE LOSS OF INDEPENDENCE.

The formation of the United States of Europe will mean for the several states something of a loss of independence. This will consist in—

1. The establishment of the principle that the settlement of disputes between states must either be in accordance with a general system provided in the constitution or one mutually agreed to. Peaceful settlement will be insisted upon.

2. The possibility of building up huge armaments will no longer exist.

3. The organization will be one wherein a state will not be permitted to withdraw. It will be "an indestructible Union of indestructible states," the same as is our American Union. Each of the states in the United States of Europe will have to submit to the reign of real international law; that is, submit to whatever law the United States of Europe shall enact.

These three illustrations show some of the ways whereby each of the leading national states in Europe would lose some of its independence. It would be similar to the loss of liberty which each person gladly accepts when living in a commonwealth among other people. Each is limited by the like liberties of all.

And the rules of conduct are mutually agreed to. An Anarchist is one who refuses to submit to these human laws, declaring that he will be limited only by his own will. Such an individual *is compelled to submit to the mutually necessary laws*. And now the Allies propose that the two Military States of Europe, ruled by those who were threatened by the Socialists with confiscation of their property and possible death, shall be made to submit to such international law of the United States of Europe as shall mutually be agreed upon, to include, probably, protection from the Socialists, but no protection from the Liberal parties. The ruling power in Germany and in Austria-Hungary was repeatedly given an opportunity to agree to give up the idea of conquest and it refused (pages 7-8), being hard pressed by the Socialists; now, as the result of a most horrible war, they doubtless will be compelled to enter into permanent peace and disarmament—the establishment of the United States of Europe, in which their loss of independence will be no greater than that of the other states. In addition, they are likely to receive a guaranty of protection from the Socialists.

According to a statement by the British Prime Minister on July 21, 1915, there is no change in the Government's attitude. This was reiterated unofficially on September 3, 1915, the day after Cardinal Gibbons called on President Wilson in behalf of peace. On September 4 "the London press almost without exception indorsed the attitude of the Government that there must be no peace with Germany until the menace of 'Prussian Militarism' is removed." Thus the issue is squarely joined. The Allies are pledged to abolish war in Europe, and after this is accomplished then will be formed the United States of the World.

DEFINITENESS OF THE PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL LAW.

One feature of the forthcoming United States of Europe will be the fact that a written constitution will mark out the fundamental rights of the several states. This will greatly simplify

and make clear their relationship. At present the stronger of the nations are prone to stretch their claims in order to get what does not rightfully belong to them. It is part of the robber spirit, to be effectually curbed only by the formation of the United States of Europe, the written constitution to include a statement of the mutual rights of the several states, and to be backed by the united power of all to compel peaceful submission thereto.

MORE PRACTICABLE THAN COMPULSORY ARBITRATION.

This system is vastly more practicable than Compulsory Arbitration. That system of itself does not include the definite marking out of the mutual rights of the states until *after* disputes shall have arisen. But by marking out definitely the international rights there will no longer be the objection to compulsory peaceful settlement of international disputes which formerly applied.

Furthermore, in place of the provision for a board of arbitrators, who are *not* governed by definitely stated rules of justice, and who are inclined to be swayed by personal ties, there will be provided a regularly constituted court of experts who will be sworn to apply to the settlement of international disputes a body of definitely stated principles. This is the juristic system as distinguished from arbitration.

UP-TO-DATE PEOPLE'S RULE.

Of even more importance than are these two improvements, exceedingly great as they are, will be the benefits derived if there is established an up-to-date system of People's rule in connection with the international government. The self-interest of the people—the voters—is such that they are the ones with whom should reside the final power. No longer can it rightfully be said that the facts in connection with controverted points cannot be gotten to them, and that there is no way whereby they can express their will. Some of the particulars of the improved methods are stated in the next chapter.

A PRACTICABLE PLAN.

Enough of the details have been given to show that the plan for a United States of Europe is practicable. Every objection that can be urged is fallacious. If it be said that a self-respecting national state should insist on reserving to itself the determining of questions of honor and of vital interest, the answer is that that principle is precisely what each individual Anarchist insists upon, and that there is much more reason why the people of the world should insist that State Anarchists be controlled than that individual anarchists shall be controlled. Each independent state has been saying that it will do as it chooses provided it is strong enough, just as individual anarchists have refused to be bound by human law; but a time has arrived when the system has become so hurtful that the British Liberal Government is saying that it must cease in Europe, and the rest of the Allies are agreed (page 8, above). Just as individuals in human society are obliged to give up some of their independence, so must the states of Europe give up a portion of their independence; that is, give up their power to declare war and be obliged to live henceforth amid the reign of International Law, peaceably and without costly armament. At the start the international regulations thus impressed upon each portion of Europe will be limited, doubtless, to the maintaining of peace. The plan is thoroughly practicable. In fact, the conditions have become such that it is now inconceivable that the Allies will again consent to live among State Anarchists—states armed to the utmost extent of which they are capable, ready to spring at each others' throats.

After the United States of Europe is formed the time will be ripe for the final step in the attainment of world peace, the establishment of The Peace Council of the World—the United States of the World, the World State or Federation of the World.

WEAKNESS IN THE TAFT PLAN.

Former President Taft, now of Yale University, is President of the American Branch of the League to Enforce Peace. The

organization was formed at Philadelphia, June, 1915. Invitations had been extended to certain leading men and 110 responded. The plan adopted was as framed by the ones who called the meeting.

There are four main points in the plan advocated by this organization:

1. It is said that some questions exist which no nation is in honor bound to have decided in any other way than by its own will. In the language of the old-style diplomacy, some cases are non-justiciable.

2. It is said that the basis of future world peace must continue to be Treaties. "We cannot," says Mr. Taft, "give up treaties because sometimes broken."

3. It is said that war must still be legally possible after certain procedure shall have been gone through with.

4. That in order to compel submission to the procedure proposed *before going to war* a League to Enforce Peace is suggested.

The weakness in this plan is that it would leave the national states Independent, so that each would still be an Anarchist. Accordingly the various states would still be required to endure the heavy expense of armaments.

This distinction is of vast importance. Under the Taft plan the world for the next few years, at least, would become two immense military camps, one being that of the German Allies and Turkey, the other the rest of the world; whereas under the United States of Europe and of the World, each nation would be obliged to at once cease the manufacture of munitions of war except for internal police duty, and leave to the International Government, directly under the control of the People and their Representatives, the enforcement of peaceful settlement of international disputes. Under this latter system a sense of security would at once come about, the same as exists between the 48 states of our American Union. Our states are not armed except for internal police duty nor will the rest of the world be

when the Federal System is extended as it should be. That event is sure to take place some time and the correct thing to do is to at once take the needed next step! Fortunately the Allies are equal to the need. In the words of the British Prime Minister, We stand for "a real European partnership based on the recognition of Equal Rights, and established and enforced by a Common Will"—the United States of Europe!

Furthermore, only through the establishment of an International Government can freedom of the Slavs in Austria-Hungary and in Germany, and freedom of the Hungarians be brought about, as will appear in a subsequent chapter.

Lastly—and this is vitally important—in connection with the United States of Europe there can be established an effective protection from the delusions of the Socialists.

CHAPTER III.

THE UP-TO-DATE MECHANISM OF THE PEOPLE'S RULE.

During recent years in the more advanced countries or communities numerous developments have taken place in the mechanism through which the People rule. These improvements in the mechanism make more effective the ruling power upon our earth. Among the new devices are the following:

While the people because they are widely separated throughout the earth's surface *must act very largely through Representatives*, yet by means of the establishment in themselves of a veto power through the Referendum, and a power of direct legislation through the Initiative, coupled with the establishment in themselves of a right to instruct through the Advisory Referendum and the Advisory Initiative, *the final power on all important political questions can be lodged in the voters*. In other words, the mechanism of popular government has developed to the point where, should it be applied in the International Government in Europe and throughout the World, *the voters in the*

several nations can give specific instructions to their Peace Counsellors whenever it is thought best (using the Advisory Referendum or the Advisory Initiative), and can pass on questions referred to them by the Peace Council itself (using the Referendum), and can directly pass on questions proposed by a given percentage of the voters (using the Initiative). This is in addition to the more easily operated system of instructions by the directly elected representatives in the National Parliaments or Lower Houses, and the exercise by them of the right to recall Peace Counsellors.

Each question can thus be separated out and the arguments of the opposing leaders can be placed before the voters by means of Government Publicity Pamphlets. Thus it is practicable to at once establish a system wherein the people *cannot be prevented from receiving the statements of the several political leaders.*

This system of government is an application of the law of Agency; a personal relationship which every adult being is permitted to apply in his personal affairs, and certainly should be applied in the cooperative affairs of the people of all the world.

A precedent for the establishment of a real agency between the people and their representatives is the people's successful prosecution of their war for liberty in the Thirteen **A Precedent.** American Colonies, 1776 to 1783. *The final power resided in the voters at all times.* The members of the Continental Congress were subject to instructions and subject to recall by the Legislatures, while each member of the Legislature was subject to binding instructions by the voters in his district. **THUS THE CONTINENTAL CONGRESS WAS FIRMLY HELD TO THE PEOPLE'S INTERESTS EVEN THOUGH THE MONEYED INTERESTS IN THIS COUNTRY WERE LARGELY TORIES.**

The fundamental principle is that the Voters *shall actually rule*, with no make-believe about it.

CHAPTER IV.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION AS TO WORLD
PEACE.

In Chapter I the evidence shows that the Allies are pledged to abolish war. The evidence in Chapter II shows that in the proposed United States of Europe, limited at the start to the people now at war, the Allies are not to receive any special privilege but are to come in on a par with the other states. The evidence in Chapter III demonstrates that a United States of Europe will be practicable if the final power is placed in the people—the voters, those who in case of war must go to the front. It is not enough that Representatives shall control the United States of Europe.

What objections are there to this proposed United States of Europe, the functions of which are to be limited at the start to the establishment of Permanent Peace and Disarmament? In Chapter II we have shown that from the standpoint of the promotion of the People's interest—the welfare of humanity, it is practicable.

Why have the German and the Austro-Hungarian governments refused to enter into an international agreement for permanent peace and disarmament? Because of the certain injuries to those who now are the ruling few in these countries should the Socialist Party in each of these countries become the ruling power, *as it might possibly have done had there been a cessation of attention from outside politics*. But our plan of government for the United States of Europe supplies protection from the errors in the Socialist Theory.

THERE BEING, THEN, A PRACTICABLE SYSTEM OF GOVERNMENT FOR THE UNITED STATES OF EUROPE AND OF THE WORLD, IT FOLLOWS THAT IT SHOULD BE APPLIED, RATHER THAN THAT THERE SHOULD BE CONTINUED THE PRINCIPLE THAT MIGHT MAKES RIGHT, ACCOMPANIED WITH MILITARISM AND AT ANY TIME A POSSIBLE WAR.

The welfare of the German people themselves will be promoted by the establishment of the United States of Europe and of the World. The system will be an improvement, a benefit to all.

How can we help to install this vast improvement? By spreading a knowledge of the facts. Ideas rule the world.

At present very, very few people know the real facts in the case. We, the people of the countries not at war, should become thoroughly familiar with the plan for the United States of Europe and of the World. *In proportion as this is accomplished there will follow an expression of opinion favorable to the immediate stopping of the war on the proposed basis.* **THUS BY SPREADING A KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACTS IN THE CASE WE CAN HELP TO TERMINATE THE WAR, AND BY SO DOING CAN HELP TO PREVENT THE SUCCESS OF MILITARISM AND CONQUEST.**

It follows that the thing to do is to stop being pro=Ally or pro=German and present the Peace Plan. It is favorable to both sides. The presentation of this plan challenges attention and opens the way to the consideration of a practical way to help stop the war. We do not ask that the Allies shall win, or that the Germans shall win, but that an immediate cessation of the war shall come about as the outcome of the presentation of this sensible plan.

FREEDOM THROUGHOUT EUROPE.

Along with the idea of the establishment of the United States of Europe, with its permanent peace and disarmament, there bursts upon our view a practicable plan for freeing such of the people of Europe as are held as vassals—political slaves, the people of Alsace and Lorraine, of Poland and the rest of the Slavs outside the Balkan States, also the Italians in Austria. *Up to the present time and as long as Might is to make Right the necessity for military strength will compel the governments in Germany, Austria-Hungary, France, Italy, Russia and the rest of Europe to do whatever will make them the most formidable in war; that is, they will be obliged to sacrifice freedom for safety.*

But along with the acceptance of the idea of abolishing war and all need for preparing for war, FREEDOM WILL AT ONCE RESULT FOR EACH NATIONALITY. The Germans will not consent to be injured by the presence of Polish controversies, or controversies with the rest of the Slavs or with the Hungarians and the Italians. Each nationality will wish to trade with every other nationality but will desire to live peaceably by itself. The center of interest will have passed from the necessity for combining against would-be murderers to competition in trade. Everything will center upon that, along with the study of how to protect the citizens of one state from the lower standards of other states. But it can all be worked out peaceably.

PROPOSED PEACE TERMS.

In view of the tremendous advantages to be gained from the proposed change, both sides in the present conflict can well afford to agree to exceedingly reasonable terms. The ruling few among the German Allies, together with the rest of the people in those countries, can get protection from the Socialists (page 9, above) and achieve their ideal of becoming the equal of Great Britain on the seas, with no possible danger to themselves from the Slavs. The German efficiency in industry will have a free field unhampered by the cost of military armament. That should satisfy the Germans.

The Allies, too, can get what they want. They can get permanent peace and disarmament, with no possible danger to the source of their food supplies. The people of France can protect their high standard of living, keeping out whatever classes of immigrants they may decide upon. They will receive back into the national family such portions of Alsace and Lorraine as freely choose to come with them. The people of Italy can receive back the provinces wrung from them by Austria-Hungary and forthwith reduce their military expenses. The Balkan States will be able to stay apart and develop normally, each with suitable sea ports. The Russian Government will

be free from the menace of German Militarism, and, being no longer obliged to plan for military strength, can go ahead and develop Federal Government, entirely relieved of danger from the Socialists. Then the people of Finland can be granted the powers which Militarism has caused to be kept from them. Each subdivision of the vast Russian territory can be developed in a manner befitting its stage of development, the same as is being done in the British territory.

Thus every group of people in Europe will be benefited by the establishment of the European Peace Council, compulsory to all the powers now at war, and permanent. By introducing our plan for protection from the Socialists, the United States of Europe becomes practicable, both for the German Allies and for Russia. Although the deluded Socialists would thunder at the combination, the advances under Liberal Government have become so great that the present-day Socialists would soon turn their attention toward helping to get reforms instead of fighting the patriots who are securing them. Thus the Socialists would become Reformers and so merge into the Liberal parties. If they will organize within the Liberal parties and question candidates for the needed "next steps" they will become exceedingly helpful.

In order that peace terms along the lines indicated shall actually be taken up by the German Government, it should realize, as it doubtless does, that all the world outside of the three oligarchies that compose the Central Powers are in self-defense opposed to the success of Militarism and Conquest,* including World Dominion in the German Government, similar to the power exercised by the Roman Government in ancient

*For example, on August 16, 1915, the National Liberal party of Germany, through its executive committee in the Reichstag, declared as follows:

"The outcome of the present war can only be a peace which, expanding our frontier east, west and overseas, will protect us militarily, politically and economically, against new attacks and compensate us for the enormous sacrifices which the German nation already has made and is determined to continue until a victorious conclusion."

Complete confidence in Ernest Basserman, leader of the National Liberal party, was expressed and an announcement was made that the party would

days,† and that all of the world outside the three Oligarchies realizes the importance of “hanging together” at this time and so avoid “hanging singly” later. Already some 850,000,000 people are banded together as the Allies to prevent the success of the 150,000,000 of the German Allies and Turkey; and back of the Allies are the factories and the granaries of the rest of the world. There can be but one ultimate outcome. The world is to pass into an era of World Peace and Disarmament. The sensible thing to do is to recognize it and stop the war—stop killing the people, besides impoverishing those who are left. Each minute of this war results on the average in the death of four men. In twelve months something like 2,000,000 men have been butchered, and 5,000,000 wounded. 21,000,000 men are said to be in the field. All of this is horrible beyond words to express. Its continuance is entirely unnecessary if the two sides will but see that the United States of Europe is to be established and that it will protect mankind from the Socialists.

In view of the certainty that Militarism is to be terminated with this war, the Congress of the United States will surely take active steps toward the needed United States of the World. While some of the bankers and other moneyed people in this country are cooperating with the Allies in financing the necessary

stand solidly back of any government pursuing with unbending firmness the aims outlined in the resolutions, which were adopted with only two dissenting votes.

Of course the Conservative and the Clerical parties are for conquest.

The foregoing announcement by the so-called liberals was followed by the presentation of memorials in the same strain by six industrial organizations “representing the politically powerful reactionary agrarians or junkers, and also the highly centralized influences of the mighty industrial concerns, including at least a portion, if not all, of the Krupp interests.” This statement is by Karl H. von Wiegand in a press dispatch of August 20 and he characterizes the demand as being for “wholesale annexation.”

†WORLD DOMINION.

Under reactionary influences the governmental power centralizes, inevitably, and the ruling few are self-assertive and arrogant. For example, in the *Washington Post* under date line of September 2, 1915, the following appeared: “An authoritative, though unofficial, statement from the GERMAN EMBASSY to-day is * * * That the Allies can at this time establish a peace by agreeing * * * 3. That the Jews of all countries be

loans as long as the Oligarchies continue to fight, Congress should do whatever will best promote the establishment of Permanent Peace and Disarmament—the United States of the World.

CHAPTER V.

EXPERT OPINION.

In Chapter I we have shown that both the Liberal and the Conservative parties in Great Britain are agreed that permanent peace shall be established. Here in the United States we are not so unanimous. Former President Taft and more than one hundred others have formed the AMERICAN BRANCH OF THE LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE. This organization proposes that the states of the world shall continue as independent powers, armed in whatever manner they think best. The proposed enforcement of peace is merely to compel the states to not declare war until at least one year shall elapse from the time that notice of a forthcoming war shall be issued, and at all times an armament may be built up. Details are at page 14, above.

That plan is impracticable as compared with the program declared for by the Allies. The Taft plan is the Conservative Plan, a plan aimed to continue the existence of Independent States—Anarchist States. The Taft plan is the last ditch

unequivocally accorded their inalienable rights as human beings." *Note that the proposal is that "ALL COUNTRIES" are to become vassals of the German Government if it wins.*

In the words of the ITALIAN PRIME MINISTER, Antonio Salandra, in the capitol of Rome, June 21, 1915, in reply to the Emperor of Austria and the German Chancellor: "I am speaking from the Capitol and in this solemn hour do represent the People and the Government of Italy, I, a modest burgess, feel myself nobler far than the Head of the Hapsburgs. (Cries of Bravo! and loud cheers.) * * * I must say, in the name of my country no vassalage; no protectorate under any one. The dream of universal hegemony [over-lordship] has been shattered. The whole world is risen up against it. The peace and civilization of humanity must in the future

of the conservative forces. Compare the following utterance by other leading statesmen in these United States:

On February 16, 1915, the board of trustees of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, D. C., issued a two-page statement the last half of which says:

"It seems incredible that after this the stricken people [of the world] will set their feet in the same old paths of policy and suspicion which must lead them again to the same result.

"Finding expression through a great multitude of voices everywhere *the general public opinion of mankind should influence the minds of the negotiators who settle the terms of peace and inspire them to a NEW DEPARTURE IN THE ESTABLISHMENT OF JUSTICE AS THE RULE OF INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS.*

"While we must not be overconfident of our individual qualifications to point out the detailed methods through which the result may be accomplished, we may still advocate measures which seem practicable and appropriate to the purpose.

"WE CAN SEE THAT DEFINITE RULES OF NATIONAL CONDUCT SHOULD BE AGREED UPON; THAT A COURT OF COMPETENT JURISDICTION SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED TO JUDGE OF NATIONAL CONFORMITY TO THOSE RULES; AND THAT NEW SANCTIONS SHOULD BE PROVIDED TO COMPEL RESPECT FOR THE JUDGMENTS RENDERED. [A UNITED STATES OF THE WORLD.]

"ABOVE ALL THE MOTIVE AND SPIRIT OF THE NEW INSTITUTIONS SHOULD BE CLEARLY AND FULLY, NOT THE PROMOTION OF AMBITION OR THE EXTENSION OF POWER, BUT THE SAFEGUARDING OF HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE PERFECTION OF INDIVIDUAL LIBERTY. [THE PEOPLE IN CONTROL.]

be based on respect for existing nationalities (loud cheers), among which Germany must take her seat as an equal and not as a mistress." (Loud cheers.)

PROFESSOR GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD, of Yale University, says: "What, then, is the supreme issue in the war in Europe? It is nothing less than this: Whether a Representative Democracy or a Military Autocracy shall be dominant in Europe and the Near East, AND SO MOST AGGRESSIVE AND INFLUENTIAL OVER THE WHOLE CIVILIZED WORLD; whether the national existence of the weak shall be defended, or mighty empires shall trample them under their feet. Shall the triumph go to the cause which, with whatever deficiencies at present and faults and crimes in the past, on the whole stands for government of the people, by the people, and for the people; or shall victory 'perch on the banners' of the two nations of Central Europe whose monarchs still claim to rule over the people by Divine right,

"Toward this high end the courage and hope and conviction of the humblest citizen of the most distant land may contribute.

JOSEPH H. CHOATE	JAMES L. SLAYDEN
ANDREW D. WHITE	JOHN SHARP WILLIAMS
JOHN W. FOSTER	CHARLES L. TAYLOR
ELIHU ROOT	HENRY S. PRITCHETT
LUKE E. WRIGHT	WILLIAM M. HOWARD
CHARLEMAGNE TOWER	CLEVELAND H. DODGE
ROBERT S. WOODWARD	ROBERT A. FRANKS
AUSTEN G. FOX	GEORGE W. PERKINS
JACOB G. SCHMIDLAPP	NICHOLAS MURRAY BUTLER
THOMAS BURKE	ANDREW J. MONTAGUE
ROBERT S. BROOKINGS	ARTHUR WILLIAM FOSTER
OSCAR S. STRAUS	JAMES BROWN SCOTT."
SAMUEL MATHER	

This is a glorious statement! All that is lacking is the use of the words which we have placed in brackets.

After Theodore Roosevelt had been awarded the Nobel Peace prize, he at an address in Sweden, May 5, 1910, said:

"The supreme difficulty in connection with developing the peace work at the Hague arises from the lack of any executive power, of any police power, to enforce the decrees of the court."

He also is being quoted as saying:

"The futility of international agreements in great crises has come from the fact that force was not back of them. What is needed in international matters is to create a judge and then to

as the vice regents of God, and responsible to Him alone, empowered and determined to enforce their will by an army of conscripts whose allegiance is claimed as primarily due to them as persons, rather than due as free citizens to the defense of the country, whose control remains both theoretically and actually in the hands of the citizens themselves?

Later he states that "Russia is now fighting and suffering to deliver Europe and the world at large from the spread by force of a military and undemocratic imperialism." For a time during September, 1915, a Liberal Duma existed in Russia.

Professor Ladd continues: "Now when the question is put in this way there can be little doubt how the American public ought to answer it."

THE GERMAN GOVERNMENT HAS ACTUALLY COMMENCED TO APPLY ITS LAWS WITHIN OUR TERRITORIAL AREA. The German consul at Philadelphia, Dr. George Stobbe, has admitted that he has issued a warning to the Orenstein-Arthur-Koppel Company, an American firm incorporated under

put power back of the judge. The policeman must be put back of the judge in international law just as he is back of the judge in municipal law. The effective power of civilization must be put back of civilization's collective purpose to secure reasonable justice between nation and nation. *We must labor for an international agreement among the great civilized nations which shall put the full force of all of them back of any one of them, and of any well-behaved weak nation which is wronged by any other power.*"

PRESIDENT EMERITUS ELIOT has expressed himself as follows:

**President
Eliot and
Others.** "There can be no secure peace in Europe until a federation of the European States is established, capable of making public contracts *intended to be kept and backed by an overwhelming international force subject to the orders of an international tribunal.*"

Says CONGRESSMAN F. O. SMITH, of Maryland, in a speech before the House of Representatives: "All the peace that ever existed within any nation is *compulsory*; it would not last five minutes were it not for the presence of the executive power with its well-filled store of powder and ball. It is inconceivable how universal peace could exist without a similar executive power strong enough to beat down all opposition and compelled by self-interest to maintain peace."

PROFESSOR IRVING FISHER, of Yale, says: "The term 'international law' is really a misnomer. To be real, a law implies

the laws of the United States, but composed largely of Germans, THAT THEY WILL BE HELD ACCOUNTABLE BY THE KAISER'S GOVERNMENT IN THE EVENT OF THEIR FILLING AN ORDER FOR RAILROAD SUPPLIES TO THE RUSSIAN GOVERNMENT. That is, if they render any assistance to a foreign power at war with Germany they will be liable to punishment for treason—punishment by the death penalty or imprisonment at hard labor for life or a term of years if the German Government can get hold of them.

Similar warnings have been sent from Germany to German societies in this country.

While the present claim is that *the German laws apply in this country only to German subjects*, it is reported that MOST OF THE GERMANS WHO HAVE BECOME NATURALIZED IN THIS COUNTRY ARE STILL CONSIDERED BY THE KAISER'S GOVERNMENT AS ITS SUBJECTS. (*Washington Post*, Sept. 5, 1915, p. 1, editorial section.) This is directly opposed to the American law which obliges each person naturalized to renounce his allegiance to every other sovereignty. Should the German Government win in this war it doubtless

enforcement. At present we have no international law because we have no international force." ("After the War, What?")

This writer further says: "It may be difficult for us to admit the fact, but if our forty-eight states, instead of having a Federal Government, had each its own independent government and military, we should find ourselves in the same situation as Europe. There would inevitably be increasing armies, oppressive taxation, and eventual war.

"The family of nations in Europe cannot live together in peace unless they govern themselves. They lack government, precisely as the gold miner in California in the 50's lacked government. Here were a number of selfish men suddenly brought into close proximity without any government. The consequence was that each had to carry firearms. Then vigilance committees were improvised, and later a stable government brought disarmament. In the beginning each individual was sovereign; but he soon found it profitable to surrender part of his independence to secure protection. The nations need to protect themselves from themselves. We might well write over the parti-colored map of Europe: *Wanted, an International Government*. Only such a government, or at any rate some form of international bond, bids fair to cure the disease."

In the CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES the following-named members have introduced resolutions asking for the establishment of International Government that shall provide for

would more and more assert that its laws apply in the United States and other lands.

Ambassador Dumba of Austria-Hungary publicly asserted the same extraordinary principle as to citizens not yet naturalized and the United States Government asked that he be recalled.

A TENDENCY TO WORLD DOMINATION HAS BEEN AND IS TO-DAY THE IMPERIAL GERMAN CHARACTERISTIC. While the Kaiser was on his trip to Jerusalem he, at Damascus, November 7, 1908, proclaimed himself the protector not only of the barbarous Turks but of the whole Mohammedan world, most of which is under the British and Russian flags. Three years earlier, while Russia was prostrated from her defeat by Japan and internal revolution was being waged the Kaiser suddenly landed in Morocco, wherein Russia's ally, France, together with Spain, were dominant, and declared the Sultan to be an independent sovereign in whose lands all powers were on the same foot-

permanent peace: Senators Robert L. Owen, Robert M. La Follette, John F. Shafroth, and Francis G. Newlands; Representatives Richard Bartholdt, Charles F. Curry, Robert H. Gittens and Walter L. Hensley.

Suggestions for an International Constitution have been proposed and published by DR. C. F. TAYLOR of Philadelphia. (*Equity*, Oct., 1914; *Philadelphia American*, Dec. 20, 1914.)

The WOMEN'S PEACE PARTY of the United States declares for:

"5. Democratic control of foreign policies.

* * * * *

"8. Action toward the gradual organization of the world to substitute Law for War."

The proposed stage of unification in Europe must come some time owing to the fact that Development—Evolution—is taking place. The establishment of the reign of International Law in Europe and throughout the world is as certain as that the sun is to continue to rise.

**Kant's
Forecast,
1798.**

More than a century ago it was outlined in detail by that noted philosopher, scientist and humanitarian, Immanuel Kant. A translation in English of his writings on this subject entitled *Eternal Peace* is published by The World Peace Foundation, Boston; 179 pages. An introduction by Edwin D. Meade brings the points together and gives other valuable data.

ing. This was merely the excuse for serving France with an ultimatum to withdraw from her partnership with Great Britain. FRANCE WAS NOT STRONG ENOUGH TO RESIST GERMANY IN ARMS AND HER PRIME MINISTER, M. DELCASSÉ, WHO HAD BROUGHT ABOUT THE ALLIANCE, RESIGNED.

The same self-assertive spirit and disregard of treaty rights has prevailed in the Austro-Hungarian oligarchy. In 1908 it, backed by the Kaiser, without consulting the European Concert which by treaty in 1878 had fixed the relations in Southeast Europe, announced the annexation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Great Britain protested and Serbia and Montenegro talked of going to war. The dispute continued for some months when the Kaiser dramatically ended it by presenting an ultimatum to Russia that unless she at once desist from her support of Serbia and accept the situation Germany would at once mobilize against her. RUSSIA WAS IN NO POSITION FOR WAR AND WAS COMPELLED TO ASSENT. This was in 1909. Two years later, in the Agadir incident, the Kaiser again gave an ultimatum to France

The factor that is bringing about the United States of the World is the people's coming into power. Kant had observed the workings of the people's self-government in the United States and foretold that the spread of the system would result in a United States of the World. He tells us that in war it is the people who are killed, and, therefore, that as quickly as the people get control of most of the leading governments their self-interest will put an end to war. That principle is operating just as surely as does the law of gravitation.

Kant further points out that where the Few are in power they declare war and largely escape its horrors, frequently being not even interrupted in their festivities.

The United States of the World is practicable because of the Federal System of Government. That mechanism is the basis of human liberty. Through it the people in a community can govern themselves in local affairs while cooperating in self-government in the county, the state, and the nation, and now there is to be established the United States of Europe and the United States of the World. Through these institutions, the capstone of the Federal system, the people of Europe and of the world are to become self-governing, limited at the start to the delineating of international rights and the peaceful settlement of international disputes. For more than one hundred years we here in the United States of America have been using the Federal system in international affairs, at present the territorial area being more vast than all Europe, and now the system is to be extended and com-

that she recede from her alliance with Great Britain, but both countries stood firm and a war council at the Kaiser's palace decided that Germany was not ready for war and she receded. **FOR THE FIRST TIME THE KAISER HAD TO BEAT A RETREAT.** His previous action had raised up against him a coalition and he was not sufficiently prepared to fight it. Then followed the election in Germany in 1911-1912 in which the Socialist-Liberal combination, exasperated by the extortions perpetrated by the Conservative and Clerical Government, elected a majority in the Lower House, followed by the Liberals becoming frightened by the plans of the Socialists and withdrawing from the partnership, going over to the Kaiser, followed by the enactment of laws vastly increasing the armament and then the starting of the foreign war. (International Year Book for 1912-1913, titles Germany and Socialism.)

pleted. The whole broad earth is to be lapt in universal law. Tennyson wrote those words in 1842, at a time when Kant was widely read.

But in Tennyson's vision he foresaw that the old system would end in war. He speaks of "the nations' airy navies grappling in the central blue, . . . with the standards of the peoples plunging thro' the thunder storm; till the war drum throb'd no longer and the battleflags were furled in the Parliament of man, the Federation of the world."

Tennyson's Prediction.

Furthermore, Tennyson foresaw that it would be as Kant had predicted, under the People's rule. The poet's words are:

"There the common sense of most shall hold a fretful realm in awe,
And the kindly earth shall slumber lapt in universal law."

Since the outbreak of the war and the splendid response of the British oversea Dominions and Colonies, the self-interest of the people of the British Isles has caused their Government to notify the Premiers of the self-governing people that *they will be consulted when the time comes that peace terms are to be agreed to.* More than that, that they will be consulted "personally if possible;" which means that they probably will be invited to visit Europe and sit in the European Council that shall decide upon the precise terms.

Federal System for Great Britain.

After this promise had been publicly stated in England, last May, the Conservative leader in a speech shortly afterward declared that he hoped and believed that when the war should end that it would be possible to form a real Parliament of the British Empire.

The following month the Liberal Government invited the Canadian Premier, Mr. Borden, to come to London and become a member of the Cabinet. He accepted.

Still another month later and the Rt. Hon. T. P. O'Connor, of the British Parliament, in a special cable to America stated that Borden's presence in the London Cabinet denoted a tremendous change in the system of government, and that in Parli-

ament a majority in both of the parties were agreed that the Federal system should be completely established—a parliament for the Empire, and a parliament for England, another for Scotland, still another for Wales, in addition to the one already provided for Ireland, which includes proportional representation. Thus one-quarter of the globe's area is to at once become the United States of Great Britain provided the outlying states of Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa consent, as they undoubtedly will. They unquestionably will reserve to themselves, however, the right to restrict immigration, and, doubtless, they will reserve the right to regulate imports and exports. Evidently the judgment of the people's representatives in the British Isles is that the Federal System of Self-Government is ideal.

In the London Times of June 17, 1915, a leading article says: The outcome of the war must be to "put an end to the notion of world-powers altogether. . . . It must be fought on our side in the hope of a future United States of Europe and, further, of a United States of the World. And we must believe ourselves, and make our belief plain to others, that we hold our empire in trust for that future, using it now with all its reserve power against any nation that aims at predominance, but not ourselves wishing to gain any predominance through the exercise of that power."

ANTHEM TO THE WORLD STATE

DEDICATED TO ROBERT BROWNING SETTLEMENT, WALWORTH, LONDON, S.E.

God make the World one State!	One World, one destiny:
All nations, small and great,	One Race, one family:
One civic whole!	One GOD above!
Self-ruled each people be!	All States upheld in one,
All peoples linked and free!	All laws excelled in one,
Glorious in unity	All lives impelled by One,—
From pole to pole!	One Life, One Love.

CHAPTER VI.

ANSWER TO AN OBJECTION.

The inquiry has been made: Will it be right to attempt to regulate the struggle for existence and survival of the fittest in the manner proposed?

We answer that the proposal to establish the United States of Europe and of the World is to prevent the waging of war—the butchery of the human race, and the piling up of costly, and, in that case, worse-than-useless armament. Each of the other forms of competition will continue much as before. Whichever nation is most efficient will be able to sell abroad except as limited by protective tariffs. Immigration will continue except as the people of a country desire to shut it out. There are many thinly settled countries where the governments are inviting foreigners.

The history of mankind shows that progress results in the shutting out of the less and less desirable forms of competition. It used to be that each vessel owner was at liberty to capture other vessels and kill the owners, kill the passengers and kill the crew. The time came when that kind of competition was shut out. Duelling has been declared unlawful and an adequate police force attends to the enforcement of the law. The next step is to declare war to be unlawful and to provide adequate regulations for its enforcement. The Allies are demanding it, and so should the rest of mankind.

For further details concerning the evils of war consult the writings of David Starr Jordan, President of Leland Stanford University. Professor William James in his miscellaneous writings tells of the various fields of work outside of war where courage is being developed.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 934 786 6

SS

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 020 934 786 6